



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

fault common to the pseudo-Hackman style and that of Croft; so is the rhetorical question, which though distinctly a mark of Croft, everywhere and always, occurs infrequently in Hackman—who had real questions to ask his love.

What, at length, shall be said of the literary interest of the letters? Apart from the Chatterton story, that of James Hackman and Martha Reay is quite worth reprinting and reading. Mr. Burgess deserves our thanks for it; for nobody ever gave the world the story of a more genuine, a more passionately sustained devotion than that of Hackman. It may be called unwise, it certainly was not without fault; but it was ethically worth a world of such long-lived liaisons as that of Lord Sandwich. Literature has hardly a more pathetic figure to show than poor Hackman at Newgate. The letters, ostensibly written from the condemned cell, bear many marks of being, at least in their main content, genuine. These moreover when published had presumably to pass the scrutiny of the Rev. Charles Parker, in whose custody they were left by Hackman. The remorse of the condemned man, the awful dream that beset him, the relief from himself that he sought in writing to Parker, are things natural and credible. Compare the following passage, which has the true, sad ring, with the similar but strained interpolation (if such it be) which is quoted above ("Should the pen of fancy, etc.")—

"Were these scraps of paper to be seen by any other eye than yours, common people would wonder that, in proportion as the moment drew nearer, I got further and further from myself. It may be contrary to the rules of critics, but so it is. To think, or to write about myself, is death, is hell. My feelings will not suffer me to date these different papers any more" (p. 176).

The recital of the dream, made in Hackman's short, half-stifled sentences, has the poetry that is wrung out of human life with the bloody sweat of despair. A soul has reached the place (where many a soul has all too suddenly found itself), in which the obtrusive realities of the concrete world seem but shadows as compared with the dread facts of the spiritual world. And the letter has the awful eloquence which bursts out of supreme

human anguish when the victim tries to temper his pain by expressing it. He sees his Beloved—her face, her person cast anew in angel moulds; her mind he sees as plainly as her face, but it is not capable of alteration for the better; her whom he has sent to her account with all her foibles on her head, and these she must expiate. Over the fixt gulf between them he sees her smile at his sufferings, and bid her companion angel, too, enjoy them.

"Oh! how I rejoiced, how I wept, sobbed with joy, when I awoke, and discovered it was only a dream, and found myself in the condemned cell of Newgate."

E. H. LEWIS.

The University of Chicago.

FAUST'S FIRST MONOLOGUE AND THE EARTH-SPIRIT-SCENE IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT CRITICISM.

THE unity of thought and composition of this part of Goethe's poem has become an especial subject of discussion since the appearance in 1885 of an essay by the late Wilhelm Scherer (*Goethe-Jahrbuch*, vi, 231), in which he claimed to have discovered at this point unmistakable evidence of interruptions, omissions, and ill-concealed changes of plan on the part of the poet. Criticisms of these views of Scherer by Professor Calvin Thomas (*Goethe's Faust*, First Part, Boston: 1892) and by J. Collin (*Untersuchungen über Goethe's Faust in seiner ältesten Gestalt. I. Der erste Monolog und die Erdgeistszene*. Inaugural-Dissertation, Giessen: 1892) have suggested the following résumé and estimate of the arguments pro and con. Here, however, we do not forget that Scherer never saw Fräulein Göchhausen's copy of Goethe's early work, commonly called the *Urfaust*, discovered and published by Erich Schmidt in 1887 and again in 1888. Nor do we lose sight of the great advantage afforded the later critics, in their strictures upon Scherer's conclusions, by the absence in this earlier version of the cracks and seams suspected by their predecessor. But in absence of positive knowledge as to the time when the Göchhausen version was written, and as to how closely or loosely this may tally with the

real as yet undiscovered *Urfaust*, it by no means follows that Scherer's hypotheses need no refutation.

The following parallel arrangement of the

SCHERER.

1. ll. 1-32.

A sort of prologue, rehearsing Faust's unsatisfactory past and thus prefacing the statement of his devotion to magic. At the end of it Scherer expects the hero to proceed straightway with his conjuring (cf. *Aufsätze über Goethe*, Berlin: 1886, pp. 310 f.).

2. ll. 33-74.

A lyric passage filled with repining at the ugly contrast between the beauty and health of Nature and the cramped and musty wretchedness of this lumber-room of a study, written according to Scherer considerably later than 1 and intended originally by the poet, not as a complement of, but as a substitute for, the first passage (p. 315).

3. ll. 75-114.

Contemplation of the magic symbols, prefaced by what Scherer regards as the inapposite exclamation "*Ihr schwebt, ihr Geister, neben mir*," etc., and accompanied by Faust's description of their effect upon his mind (pp. 310-311).

4. ll. 115-164.

The evoking of the Earth-Spirit, a passage whose only "Unebenheit" rests according to Scherer upon the mixture of prose and verse it presents (p. 322).

First, we note a discrepancy between the subdivisions of the whole passage, indicated by Scherer and tacitly accepted by Thomas (pp. 251 f.), and those maintained by Collin. All three critics are agreed in regarding the first thirty-two lines of the monologue as a well-defined group, 1. Scherer extends the second sub-division, 2, to line 75, since he refers lines 65-74 to Faust's resolve to flee from the study into the night. Collin's radically different conception of the situation expressed in these lines and the fact that for him the exclamation: "*Flieh! Auf! hinaus ins weite Land!*" is the passionate culmination of the previous reflections, lead him to regard line 66 as the beginning of the third sub-division, 3, (cf. Scherer, p. 315; and Collin, p. 18). Promising shortly to return to these points, we recall further that Scherer, though not over-confident

subdivisions of the First Monologue and the Earth-Spirit-Scene, as proposed by Scherer and by Collin, will render clearer the subsequent discussion:

COLLIN.

ll. 1-32.

A sort of prologue, rehearsing Faust's unsatisfactory past and thus prefacing the statement of his devotion to magic, interrupted by the following lyrical passage which is organically connected with the foregoing by the 'moonlight-motif' (p. 18).

2. ll. 33-65.

A lyric passage rising naturally in the mind of the disciple of Rousseau, as a kind of *sotto voce* protest against the use of magic prescribed by the legend he was bound to follow, instead of direct and loving communion with Nature, dictated by his own experience and preference. Not intended by the poet as a substitute for ll. 1-32 (cf. Scherer: *Aufsätze*, pp. 315 and 320), but as a supplementary commentary upon the character of Faust (pp. 19 f.).

3. ll. 66-106.

Faust's attitude toward the book of Nostradamus and resolve to turn directly from the symbols to their objects, all inspired by the young Goethe's pantheistic love of nature (pp. 22 and 25 f.). Contemplation of the sign of the Macrocosm and recital of its effect upon Faust's mind.

4. ll. 107-160.

The evoking of the Earth-Spirit in two-fold fashion (pp. 44 f.).

5. ll. 161-168.

Transition-monologue prefatory to the scene, *Faust and Wagner* (p. 8).

of the accuracy of this second sub-division, suspects lines 75 and 76 to be substitutes for other original lines, subsequently suppressed (p. 315 and Note), and that he extends the third portion of text to line 114, thus including eight lines assigned by Collin to the first of Faust's two attempts to evoke the Earth-Spirit (pp. 43 f.). Scherer extends the fourth division to line 164, thus overlapping part of the transition-monologue prefatory to the scene, *Faust and Wagner* (ll. 161-168), as proposed by Collin.

Scherer takes especial pains to prove two things concerning lines 1-32:

a. Their essential resemblance to the *Volksdrama* and *Puppenspiel*, and to a feature of Marlowe's *Faust*, absent from the extant versions of *Volksdrama* and *Puppenspiel*, namely, the four faculties,—a feature referable, there-

fore, according to Scherer, either to the poet's acquaintance with a version to us unknown, or to mere coincidence (p. 311).

b. Differences between 1 and 2 in content, meter, and style, so great as to warrant the assumption of the lapse of considerable time between the composition of the first and that of the second passage, and of a marked transformation in the artist, Goethe, effected in the interim (p. 320).

Scherer attributes the formal peculiarities of 1, irregular meter, familiar, archaic, or dialectic locutions, the argumentative *zwar, dafür, auch, drum, ob*, etc., to the young poet's interest in Hans-Sachs and to his translation into Hans-Sachs doggerel (*Knittelverse*) of an original prose draft of these lines (p. 321). Absence of these items in 2 is for him evidence of the intellectual and artistic progress of Goethe, who expressed his dissatisfaction with the old introduction by composing the second passage, as a substitute for 1 (p. 324). Confirmation of this view he finds in what he regards as the lack of organic connection between 2 and 3 (pp. 287 and 324). As we shall see presently, his discovery of this dissonance was materially assisted by his failure to notice the break in thought and tone, afforded by the exclamation: *Flieh! Auf! hinaus ins weite Land!* This led Scherer to extend 2 beyond l. 65 to l. 75, and to look for a bridge where no bridge was needed nor intended.

Everything in the opening lines of the passage, he argues, points to Faust's intention to make a practical application in the open air of his knowledge of magic. He purposes this, because experience has demonstrated the futility of such efforts within the four walls of the study. He has never succeeded in evoking any spirits; he is still expectant and hopeful, but also unhappy. Scherer is, therefore, surprised to hear him allude to a book, which he only needs to open to feel himself at once surrounded by spirits (pp. 310 f.). He therefore supposes that Goethe intended originally to proceed as did the *Volksdrama* and *Puppen-spiel*, assisting the hero, embarrassed for want of a suitable book, by a scene in which this should be brought him, and that he subsequently wrote 2 as a substitute for 1 plus this

missing scene (p. 324). Scherer furthermore finds need either of a missing scene or of missing words to introduce the evoking of the Earth-Spirit, l. 114 (or, l. 106). For, his argument runs (p. 322), the words:

*Ich fühl's, du schwebst um mich,
Erflehter Geist!*

are in their present context without obvious significance, since the Spirit has not yet been *erfleht* at all. He suggests the possibility that in the omitted scene Wagner interrupted Faust's attempt to evoke the Earth-Spirit, thus paving the way to a monologue in the next scene, explanatory of the hero's repeated attempts in this direction and adequately pre-facing the words just quoted (p. 323).

Professor Calvin Thomas (*Goethe's Faust*, First Part, Boston: 1892, pp. 251 f.) acknowledges the ingenuity of these arguments of Scherer and feels that they prove, at least,

"that the four passages did not proceed from a continuous creative impulse, but correspond, in part at least, to different moods and to different phases of poetic feeling and of artistic power."

He supposes an interval, though not necessarily a long interval, to have elapsed between the composition of 1, and that of 2. In 2 he finds reflected not a radically different Goethe, but only a different mood from the one traceable in 1 (Cf. p. 253). The poet

"has in mind here a Faust who has spent long nights poring over magic books; who has learned to recognize and imitate their symbols, and to know what to expect from each; who has tried to evoke spirits, tried to evoke the Earth-Spirit, but in vain, the reason being, of course, that he has not had the right book. In his own mind, however, the magician has framed a different theory to account for his failure, viz., that the symbols will not do their proper work amid the 'dust and mold' of the study, but need to be taken out into the open air."

Therefore he determines to leave the house, according to Thomas, that the symbols of Nostradamus may not prove as inoperative as all the others. Still, by way of a final trial before rushing out into the night, he exclaims to the spirits whom he as magician feels to be hovering near him:

*Ihr schwebt, ihr Geister, neben mir
Antwortet mir, wenn ihr mich hört!*

We see, therefore, that Thomas finds, as did Scherer: (a), that the four passages did not proceed from a continuous creative impulse; and (b), that an interval must have elapsed between the composition of 1 and that of 2. That he does not regard 2 as originally intended as a substitute for 1, and does not insist upon a long interval between the genesis of 1 and that of 2, distinguishes his view in degree but not in kind from that of Scherer. Their point of essential agreement is the *interruption* and *modification* of the original poetic intention, felt by both at the end of line 32. Scherer's view that the provenience of the Book of Magic originally found explanation in a scene intended to follow 1, as dramatic introduction to the conjuring scene, Thomas rejects (p. 253) as a clumsy device of the puppet-plays, no less mysterious than the book itself. "It was just as well, therefore, simply to assume that Faust has the book from the outset." (*Ibid.*) This seems to me a judicious observation, stating pithily the adequate objection to this part of Scherer's argument. But Thomas proceeds straightway to the assumption of a decided change of plan in 2, substituting for the Faust of 1, inexperienced in conjuring, a man whose initial experiment in this line is long since a matter of the past. Now, in all the mention of apparatus and books, contained in 2, there is not a syllable of evidence that Faust has hitherto used them for the purposes of Magic. His study may for years have abounded in books of magic; but his investigations have apparently hitherto all been along natural and not supernatural lines. I can find not the slightest textual warrant for Thomas' inference that the Faust of 2 is already experienced as conjuror. On the contrary, everything in the text itself seems to me to point to Faust's inexperience in the use of magic, not only in 1 but also in 2. This view is further strengthened by the form *werde* (*Urfaust*, l. 26), quoted by Thomas in connection with 1 (p. 253), in place of *würde* in the Fragment of 1790. This *werde* points vividly to something expected from a new, as yet untried, experience. And the use of *würde* in the Fragment and in the edition of 1808 by no means implies necessarily: "I have been devoting myself to magic (for some time) to see

whether many a secret *would* not be revealed to me" (cf. Thomas, p. 254). It may at least with equal propriety be translated: "Therefore I have devoted myself to magic (=have now resolved to try magic) to see whether many a secret *may* not be revealed to me." *Würde* in place of *werde* simply renders less confident the expectation of Faust and emphasizes the groping uncertainty of the situation. This last is the interpretation of Scherer, who finds confirmatory evidence of its correctness in the *nun* of the first and the fifth lines:

Habe nun, ach! philosophie
Da steh ich nun, ich armer Thor! (p. 312).

There is certainly nothing in the syntax of the passage that transforms the novice into the adept in matters of magic.

Now, the assumption of Thomas that Faust, after convincing himself of the inefficacy of the symbols, when employed within doors, and after resolving to try them in the open air, is sufficiently influenced by his conviction of the immediate presence of Spirits to make him remain where he is for another experiment, involves a psychological improbability that is a serious objection to this interpretation. For what is there in a long series of fruitless attempts at evoking spirits to produce such a conviction of their accessibility as to make a man, bent upon avoiding a repetition of past failure by rushing out into the night, pause in mid-career and accept again the old conditions? Another point deserving passing mention is Thomas' own theory as to the failure of the symbols in Faust's previous efforts at conjuring. He writes: ". . . the reason being, of course, that he has not had the right book" (p. 253). But there is no mention of any other Book of Magic in the whole Monologue and Earth-Spirit Scene than that of Nostradamus. This consideration and the absence of satisfactory evidence in passage 2 of even a single past attempt on the part of Faust at evoking spirits, emphasized in the foregoing considerations, render unsatisfactory this explanation of the situation. Thus Thomas seems to remove several of the difficulties felt by Scherer, by the introduction of others nearly as grave, and he accepts as real the hiatus felt by Scherer before the words:

*Ich fühl's, du schwebst um mich,
Erflehter Geist.*

This latter point is included in the following discussion.

We turn now to the argument of Collin in its application to the views under discussion. Recalling his restriction of passage 2 to lines 33-65 (cf. parallel columns) because of the change of tone, noticeable directly after the exclamation: *Flieh! Auf! hinaus ins weite Land!*, we are interested in his reply to Scherer's question why Faust does not leave the study and seek the open air. This would have been entirely consistent, he says, with the mood of the nature-loving poet, but equally inconsistent with the Faust-legend, that prescribed belief in the use of Magic (p. 20). Faust as yet only partially understands the previous silent invitation of the moonlight to eschew Magic and to turn directly to Nature herself for inspiration and for guidance. His blindness to the better way, the direct approach to nature, removed for an instant while he speaks these words, is a tragic element of the traditional frame-work, to whose poetic treatment Goethe was committed (p. 22). The desirability of intimate knowledge of the secret workings of Nature Faust feels keenly, but he still believes that the highroad to this insight lies in Magic. The disciple of Rousseau had the difficult task of leading the hero of the action gradually through the long apprenticeship of Magic, prescribed by the mediæval legend, to face-to-face vision, that motives the words:

*Könnst' ich Magie von meinem Pfad entfernen
Die Zaubersprüche ganz und gar verlernen,
Stünd ich, Natur, vor dir ein Mann allein,
Da wär's der Mühe wert, ein Mensch zu sein.*

(Weim. Ed. II. 11404 ff.).

The antipodal character of Nature and Learning Faust already feels at the opening of the drama, after years of struggle; not until disappointment, and distress, and sin, and crime have entered his life will he recognize the same relationship between Nature and Magic. (Collin, pp. 19-22.) We know that Goethe's early writings abound in glimpses of his own enthusiastic devotion to nature, as revealed in the outer world, and in proofs of his discriminating study of her varying phases. Numerous fragmentary expressions of this in letters

and sundry essays, written in the early seventies and the whole background of the Werther romance, are abundant evidence that the mood expressed in lines 33-65 was part of the young poet's habitual thought. What more natural than the change of tone after line 32, as protest of the young Nature-poet against the futility of that method of approaching Nature imposed, for the time being, by his choice of subject? A further consideration, not mentioned by Collin, that renders still more probable the main contention, is that this second passage throws such a side light upon Faust's desire to understand, and himself to employ in turn the creative method of Nature, as to lend additional significance and interest to all his subsequent dealings with magic. The lyrical tone and modified content of 2, noticed by Scherer, are what we should expect, if Collin's interpretation be correct. Besides, nothing deduced by the older critic from metrical and stylistic differences between 1 and 2 remains without adequate explanation in the light of this interpretation.

Faust's impulse to turn from books and apparatus to Nature, expressed in the words: *Flieh! Auf! hinaus ins weite Land!* is, accordingly, at once modified by the recollection of his resolve (*Urfaust*, I. 24) to try Magic, lost sight of during the musings suggested by the light of the full moon (*Urfaust*, II. 33 f.). Intimate knowledge of Nature! To be sure! But what better way to this than through Magic? And what better guide in the use of Magic than Nostradamus? By means of it Nature became to him an open book. Why not to Faust as well? Thus the words,

Und dies geheimnisvolle Buch

Ist dir es nicht Geleit genug?

refer not to the momentary impulse to leave the study and rush forth into the night, but to Faust's serious purpose to seek Nature through Magic under the direction of the veteran magician, Nostradamus (Collin, pp. 22 f.). They constitute the transition overlooked by Scherer and also by Thomas from 2 to 3. Nature in the line,

Wenn Natur dich unterweist,

is Nature seen through the *Zauberbuch*, not identical with that Nature to whom Faust,

blessed for an instant with the unclouded vision of his author, would flee (*Urfaust*, l. 65). With Thomas, Collin regards as trivial the question of the provenience of the book. The whole Monologue seems to him designed to present to us Faust the scholar, tired of and disgusted with fruitless, dry-as-dust learning, determined to test magic as a means for effecting what study fails to give, and to make us witnesses of his *first* experiment in evoking spirits (p. 24). Not the presence of the volume in his library but his determination to reach Nature through Magic is significant. In view of this, how impertinent the question raised by Scherer as to where he got the book and why he had not used it before, if already in his possession!

Before opening the book, Faust reflects upon the uselessness of dry meditation upon form and meaning of the symbols in this attempt to use Magic as a road to Nature (Collin, p. 25):

*Umsonst dass trocknes Sinnen hier
Die heil'gen Zeichen dir erklärt.*

Scherer and Thomas refer the word *hier* to the Study instead of to the Experiment, and still expect, therefore, to see Faust leave the room. Hence the former's conjecture as to suppressed originals of lines 75 and 76 (*Aufsätze*, p. 315 and Note), and the latter's unsatisfactory explanation of Faust's final decision to remain indoors. Faust determines to turn directly to the Spirits, whose symbols he shall find in the book. Collin traces this resolve directly to the young poet's conviction of the omnipresence of the spirit-world, as shown in *Mahomet*, *Clavigo*, *Werther*, *Faust*, and elsewhere (p. 26). Here the traditional conception of the spirit-world blends with the view of Goethe, so that he makes Faust allege the omnipresence of spirits as a reason for disregarding speculation and for addressing at once the substance indicated by the signs. Collin points out (p. 27) Scherer's double mistake (1), in overlooking this blending of modern conviction with ancient tradition and (2), in finding puzzling that the opening of a mere book should suddenly convince Faust of the close proximity of hovering Spirits (*Aufsätze*, pp. 310-311). The words,

*Ihr schwebt, ihr Geister, neben mir;
Antwortet mir, wenn ihr mich hört!*

precede the opening of the book.

Scherer finds no explanation of the word *erfleht* (*Urfaust*, l. 123) in its present context, and suspects that scenes or a scene and words, explanatory of Faust's previous vain attempts to evoke the Earth-Spirit, are for some reason missing. Thomas calls attention to this view of Scherer in a note (pp. 260-261), tacitly accepting the view of the latter. In the following we note Collin's view of the matter.

Disappointed and chagrined at his own inability to realize in actual experience the beatific vision of the creative activity of the Universe, suggested by the sign of the Macrocosm, Faust turns the leaves of the book, notes the sign of the Earth-Spirit, and feels at once his strong affinity for this Master of Earth-Life. The mistake just committed in expecting from the more remotely related Spirit-of-the-Universe what could be the result only of intimate communion with the controlling Essence of Earth-Existence, he now comprehends. He feels with a thrill of delight and accepts the challenge to enter actively into all the weal and woe of earthly experience and to contend with all the storms of life that blow, with a courage that never quails even in the face of shipwreck. In these expressions and in the words that follow them (*Urfaust*, ll. 115-121), Collin finds what he calls a preliminary conjuring of the Earth-Spirit, followed according to the stage-direction by a second attempt, with an accompaniment of the traditional mummery (p. 44).¹ Here again Goethe's own youthful conviction of the commanding influence of spiritual affinity, subsequently reflected in *Wahlverwandtschaften*, for an instant breaks through the prescription of tradition. Gradually increasing spiritual affinity, culminating in attempted self-identification with one's recognized counterpart, is the natural magic of the situation. But after this concession to his own feeling, the poet makes Faust pronounce the mystic formula, whose use preserves the framework of the legend. This explains, according to Collin, the meaning of the word

¹ Kuno Fisher recognizes the first, but overlooks the second of these conjurings. Cf. *Goethe's Faust nach seiner Entstehung, Idee und Composition*. Zweiter Band, pp. 219 f. Stuttgart: 1893.

erflehter in line 123, and also the expression of the Earth-Spirit in line 131 f.:

*Du hast mich mächtig angezogen,
An meiner Sphäre lang gezogen.*

Another consideration that seems to me additional proof of the correctness of this interpretation is that Faust's life has for years shown this increasing affinity for the Earth-Spirit, with no more than a dim recognition of the fact on his part. What else than this has inspired his past devotion to ascertaining the secrets of Nature? What else than this has quickened his impatience with the futility of book-knowledge as a means, and has led him to adopt what seems by contrast the direct method of Magic? This summoning of the Earth-Spirit in our presence is, therefore, merely the climax of a long continued soul-experience inferable from the words of the Monologue.

These considerations seem to meet squarely the difficulties thus far pointed out by those who find in this part of the poem traces of changed plan, interrupted composition, and missing passages or scenes. Without forgetting the possibility of new positive evidence, afforded by the future discovery of the real *Urfaust*, it is not too much to say, meanwhile, that Collin presents in his valuable dissertation a convincing array of presumptive evidence for the unity of plan and composition of this part of Goethe's Faust.

STARR WILLARD CUTTING.

University of Chicago.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF *Yeoman*.

VARIOUS etymologies have been proposed for the word *yeoman*; the oldest, so far as I know, and certainly the most popular derivation, connects the first syllable with Frisian *gā*, 'a district,' and cognate equivalents, and has the weight of learning and authority in its favor. It was proposed by Spelman, and has since been adopted by Junius, Wedgwood, Skeat, and Mayhew, and *The Century*, *Webster's International*, *The Standard* and other dictionaries. Most of the other proposed etymologies may be disposed of as mere unscientific guesses; as, for instance, (a) <A.S. *guma*, 'a man'; (b) a contraction of a supposed M.E.

yeme-man, 'a person in charge,' <*yeme* 'care'+*man*; (c) <A.S. *gemēne*, common; (d) <A.S. *iung man*, *geong man*, 'young man,' 'vassal.'

But the accepted etymology seems to me to be open to several objections. It looks rather strange that we should be compelled to go to the continent for the original of a very common English word, with a very peculiar meaning, when the original itself is virtually never otherwise found in English, and the peculiar signification is undiscoverable on the continent. One example of an English cognate to Frisian *gā* has been found in the compound *æl-gē*, 'a province of eels,' it is true; but as Kluge has pointed out, this word, Frisian *gā*, Ger. *Gau*, except in a few compounds and in the oldest period, is foreign to the Old Norse, Saxon, and English. We may fairly say then that no English equivalent of Frisian *gā* has yet been discovered.

Again, as Mr. Mayhew has pointed out in *The Academy* (45, 498), no satisfactory explanation of the relation between the two words, Frisian *gā* and English *yeoman*, has even been successfully attempted. There are two forms in Middle English, *zeman* and *zoman*, and to quote Mr. Mayhew:

"these forms point back to an Old English **geoman* of which the long diphthong after the palatal was pronounced *eo* (whence *zēman*) or *eō* (whence *zōman*, *yeoman*) compare O.E. *ēode* and M.E. *gēde*, *gōde*; O.E. *sēo* and M.E. *schē*, *schō*; O.E. *hēo* ('she') and M.E. *zhē*, *zhō* and (according to the *Oxford Dictionary*) *cēocan* and M.E. *chēken*, Mod.E. *choke*."

Mr. Mayhew then endeavors to establish the relation between this Old-English *gēo* (*geō*) and Frisian *gā* by means of a Germanic base *gawja*, but against this etymology I offer my first objection,—that no *gēo* (*geō*)=Fris. *gā* can be found in English, either in simple or in compound form.

If, however, we come to Stratmann's proposed etymology—that is, <A.S. *geoman*, *iuman*, all difficulties will, I think, disappear. The phonological difficulty vanishes at once. The only plausible argument against this derivation is that of Dr. Skeat; namely, that the sense is totally unsuitable.

The first thing in its favor is the habit in Old English of compounding words with *geo*, *gio*,